NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

OPEN SESSION

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,
MARCH 2, 2017

+ + + + +

The meeting convened in Room 5115, Suite 500, 401 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004, at 1:00 p.m., L. Preston Bryant, Jr., Chairman, presiding.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

L. PRESTON BRYANT, JR., Chairman
Presidential Appointee

SAJEEL S. AHMED, Department of Defense

EVAN CASH, Office of the Chairman of
the D.C. City Council

ARRINGTON DIXON, Mayoral Appointee

THOMAS GALLAS, Presidential Appointee

GEOFFREY GRIFFIS, Mayoral Appointee

PETER MAY, Department of the Interior

JOSH MCLEOD, U.S. House of Representatives

BETH WHITE, Presidential Appointee

MINA WRIGHT, General Services Administration

NCPC STAFF PRESENT:

MARCEL C. ACOSTA, Executive Director
CARLTON HART, AICP, Urban Planner
ANNE SCHUYLER, General Counsel
DIANE SULLIVAN, Director, Urban Design and Plan
Review Division
JULIA KOSTER, Secretary to the Commission

ALSO PRESENT:

RHONDA FERGUSON-AUGUSTUS

NAVID ROSHAN-AFSHAR, EYP/CDG

CHRIS GOLDSMITH, Department of State

CONTENTS

Report of Chairman 5
Report of Executive Director 6
Legislative Update 8
Consent Calendar Items
Vietnam Veterans Memorial "In Memory" Plaque 8 Metropolitan Branch Trail Expansion 9 Employee Screening Facility at the Pentagon Metro Entrance
Action Items
Foreign Missions Center Master Plan at the former Walter Reed Army Medical Center 11
George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center 2016 Master Plan Update85
Adjourn

PROCEEDINGS

1:00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Good afternoon and welcome. We bring the meeting to order.

For the record, this is the March 2017 meeting of the National Capital Planning Commission. So, welcome.

We have a -- not extensive, but important agenda today. So, if you would please, stand and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

[INSERT - AGENDA]

{Pledge of Allegiance.}

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: I would note for all in attendance that today's meeting is being live-streamed on the NCPC.gov website. So, your comments are to be known worldwide.

We do have a quorum. So, without objection, we will proceed with the agenda that has been publicly noticed.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Agenda Item No. 1 is the report of the Chairman, and I'll simply note that earlier this morning, the Commission made a field trip to the George P. Shultz Foreign Affairs Training Center, and we'll be hearing more about their plans today, and we were hosted by Mark Ostfield, who is the Deputy Director of the Foreign Services Institute and Chris Goldsmith. I think Chris is here today.

So, that was a very good trip. We learned a lot, and it puts into context, that which we will hear more about today.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Agenda Item No. 2 is the report of the Executive Director, Ms. Acosta.

MR. ACOSTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon. I just have one item to report on.

Today, the Commission will review the draft foreign mission center master plan at the former Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

But since State Department officials are in attendance today, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank Cliff Seagroves, Acting Director of the Office of Foreign Missions. State Department Attorneys, Mary Catherine Malin and Kathleen Murphy, and our own Anne Schuyler, for their hard work on completing our memorandum of agreement to successful conclusion last week.

This MOA allows us to move forward with today's review of the master plan. It establishes a review process for future chancery centers consistent with the Foreign Missions Act, and we'll learn more about this during Mr. Hart's presentation. But I'd like to thank all involved

for their good work.

[INSERT - REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, Mr.

Acosta. Any questions for Mr. Acosta?

Agenda Item No. 3 is the legislative update. Ms. Schuyler?

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

MS. SCHUYLER: All is quiet on Capitol Hill and nothing to report.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: I can assure you all is not quiet.

MS. SCHUYLER: When I say all is quiet, this pertains to the National Capital Planning Commission.

CONSENT CALENDER

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes. Agenda Item No. 4 is the consent calendar, and we have three items.

Item No. 4A is to approve comments on the concept design for the in memory plaque at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, or the National Mall, and that's submitted to us by the National Park Service.

[INSERT - VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Item 4B is to approve comments on the concept design for the Metropolitan Branch Trail Extension at Fort Totten Metro-Rail Station in Washington, D.C. That project is jointly submitted by the National Park Service and the District Department of Transportation.

[INSERT - METROPOLITAN BRANCH TRAIL EXTENSION]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Agenda Item 4C is the approval of preliminary site building plans with comments for the employee screening facility at the Pentagon Metro entrance Arlington, and that's submitted to us by the Department of Defense.

[INSERT - EMPLOYEE SCREENING FACILITY AT THE PENTAGON METRO ENTRANCE]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Are there any questions on any of those three items?

Hearing none, is there is motion on the consent calendar and --

MR. DIXON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and

MR. MAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: -- seconded. All in favor say aye.

{Chorus of ayes.}

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Opposed no?

Consent calendar is adopted.

ACTION ITEMS

FOREIGN MISSIONS CENTER MASTER PLAN AT THE FORMER WALTER REED MEDICAL CENTER

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: The two agenda items we have today, today is Department of State day at NCPC, two very important items, and the first up, Agenda Item No. 5A is approval of comments on the draft master plan for the Foreign Missions Center at the former Walter Reed Army Medical Center in

Northwest, and this is brought to us by the Department of State, and we have Mr. Hart.

MR. HART: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

The State Department has submitted the draft Foreign Missions Center master plan for Commission review.

The campus is located in the Northwest portion of the former Walter Reed Army Medical Center, which is located in Northwest Washington, D.C.

The State Department was last before the Commission in April of 2014, when they presented a concept master plan and an information presentation.

Since then, the Army has transferred the land to the State Department, which has continued with its master plan process for the Foreign Mission Center, also known as the FMC.

I'll note that this process has been slowed by a boundary change that was included in the final transfer, and I'll be describing this in

the upcoming slides.

So, the State Department is proposing this campus in support of the United States Government's treaty obligation to provide modern and secure facilities for foreign missions and international organizations in the nation's capitol.

At present, there are approximately 190 foreign embassies and 30 headquarters or offices of international organizations located in D.C. This campus will be the second Foreign Mission Center to be located within Washington.

The first was established by an act of Congress in 1968, and you know this as the International Chancery Center, which you'll see here on the left hand side of this slide. That is located at the intersection of Van Ness Street and Connecticut Avenue in Northwest.

So, where is the Foreign Mission Center? It's located in the former Walter Reed Army Medical Center which is -- you see here in this slide and outlined in red, which is basically

between 16th Street and Georgia Avenue in Northwest.

The Army operations formerly located at this site have been moved to the Naval Support Activity Bethesda campus, which is located in Montgomery County, Maryland, and you see that also identified on this slide, and also you see the International Chancery Center, which is located Southwest of the former Walter Reed campus.

I'll note that the ICC and the actual Chancery Center is now fully built out with lots assigned to Foreign Missions.

So, just so that we're on the same page, a Chancery, as defined in the comprehensive plan, is the principle office of the Foreign Mission used for diplomatic or related purposes. An embassy is the official home of the Ambassador or Chief of Mission.

So, here is the Foreign Mission Center portion of the former Walter Reed campus. The other portion of the site is controlled by the District of Columbia and the National Children's

Hospital.

The Army transferred 32 of 113 acres that make up the former Walter Reed site to the State Department in 2015, as part of a National Defense Authorization Act.

But this parcel was originally suppose to be a larger parcel, and that was 40 -- almost 44 acres. The rest of the parcel has been given to the National Children's Hospital, and that's this portion here. So, the former -- excuse me, the Foreign Mission Center used to be this entire parcel, and now it's just the -- the part that's outlined in dark color here.

This presentation will be separated into several parts. I've already gone over the overview. I'll next work -- discuss the existing conditions and then look at the staff analysis, looking at the review process, the concept plan and recommendations and then the specific topics and look at recommendations for those, as well.

So, here we have the zoning around the site. There is residential, to make it a little

easier to see, there is residential to the north and to the south, low-density residential.

Education is also to the south. East is medium-high density mixed-use. That's where the District Government is going -- is planning their portion of the project, and then to the west is park land that is under the management of the National Park Service.

Just so you're also aware, this is 16th Street. Alaska Avenue is the northern border and then there are several streets that are interior to the site. One of them is Dahlia Street, which is — comes to this side on the north, 14th Street, which is here, and then Main Drive, which is the southern border of the FMC site.

So, we have of course, some topography.

This is the -- these are the topographic conditions on the site, I'll point out a few things here.

The first is that the red color indicates the higher elevations on the site. As you can see, there are two high points located here and here. They're on the northern portion of the

campus, and the second thing is that the site slopes down from north to south. There are some steep slopes, or steeper slopes on the southern portion of this campus.

For historic resources, this -- the Walter Reed -- former Walter Reed campus is a historic district. It's listed on the National Register of Historic Places. That designation was created in 2015. There are two periods of significance.

The first is very defined period, and that's between July 11th and July 12th of 1864, and then the second one is between 1909 and 1956.

The first is because of the Civil War battle, the site's connection to a Civil War battle, and the second is the major construction on the campus.

The Civil War battle foreseen occurred during these two dates in 1864. The reason that this is important is that it was approximately the same location as the present day — this picket line is approximately the same location as the present day Dahlia Street, and

there may be some archaeological artifacts on this site.

The State Department does note that there have been -- there is anecdotal information about people finding Civil War artifacts on the campus, including cannon balls. So, the State Department is in the process of a phase two archaeological survey on its portion of the Walter Reed campus.

The second portion -- period of significance is between 1909 and 1956. The first construction occurred at -- with this -- which is this building, which is Building 1, the main hospital, and that was in 1909.

The subsequent waves of buildings followed with most of the construction occurring during Wartime in the early to mid part of the last century, and I'll also point out Building 40, which is the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Building 41, which is the Red Cross Building, and Building 57, which is a smaller building, but it's a very interesting looking building. It's the

Memorial Chapel. You see images of each one of these buildings in the -- the photos on the left hand side of the slide.

So, the plan shows that -- shows us where the natural resources are, including green grassy areas, steep sloped topography, as well as large groupings of trees, and on this slide, it's really just important to understand that on the eastern part of 14th Street, so this portion of 14th Street, are really the institutional -- larger institutional buildings.

On the portion that is west of 14th Street, on this side is really a remnant forest, and it has the smaller residential buildings, as well as the Memorial Chapel, and again Memorial Chapel, some smaller buildings here.

These are the results of a tree survey that the State Department conducted in 2012. It identified 500 trees, and some of them are locally recognized heritage trees, and so, this is helpful information to have for the campus.

So, staff analysis is fairly straight

forward with some overall comments on the proposed goals and concept plans.

Before I get into that, I wanted to describe the Commission's review process for the FMC master plan, the Foreign Missions Center master plan, as well as the individual chancery sites, and I'll describe this in -- a little bit more fully in the next slide.

Staff analyzed the -- the draft master plan and had divided the comments according to the topic areas that you here, historic preservation, transportation, security and lot development quidelines.

Staff understands that we're looking for the State Department to address these comments as it moves to the final design -- excuse me, the final master plan, which it will be submitting in the future.

So, because this is the -- the Foreign Missions Center is federal land, the Commission is reviewing the master plan pursuant to the Planning Act of 1952, and the master plan's consistency with

the relevant comprehensive plan policies.

This is in keeping with the review of other federal installation master plans. You'll hear the other master plan later in this -- in the meeting, and so, master plans in D.C. as well as in the region.

While the master plan review is fairly straight forward, the review of the chancery at the Foreign Mission Center differs from how we review other chanceries.

There are two pieces of Congressional legislation that gives NCPC the authority to review foreign missions. The first is the International Center Act of 1968.

This Act only pertains to the development of individual chanceries at the International Chancery Center. NCPC's role is to review chanceries for their conformance with the — we call it the ICC development controls, which are guidelines, and the Commission approved these development controls for all of the development at the International Chancery Center.

2.2

The other legislation is the 1982 Foreign Missions Act. The FMA, as it is known, only pertains to the development of chanceries on privately held land in D.C. So, the land basically not in the International Chancery Center, the private land not in the International Chancery Center.

The FMA prescribes that this projects will be reviewed by the Foreign Missions Board of Zoning Adjustment, or FMBZA and the NCPC executive director sits on the FMBZA, which reviews chanceries on privately held land, using six criteria.

So, since the Foreign Missions Center is a federally owned property, NCPC and the State Department work together to develop a review process for the chanceries on this campus, and Executive Director Acosta, he gave a short introduction to that in his briefing.

This culminated on February 27th, when the -- this year, when the two agencies, State Department and NCPC, executed a memorandum of

agreement that sets forth the NCPC review process for individual chancery lots at the Foreign Missions Center, and under this MOA, NCPC will use the six criteria that are contained within the Foreign Missions Act to review each chancery.

So, it is a different process, but it is the process that we'll be using moving forward.

So, let me get to the actual Foreign Missions Center master plan. First, I'll go over the goals and then discuss the part about the concept plan.

So, we evaluated the draft Foreign Missions Center's master plan for its conformance with policies contained within various elements of the comprehensive plan, including the Foreign Missions and International Organizations, Historic Preservation, Transportation, Federal Environment and Urban Design elements.

The goals that the State Department developed for the master plan are shown here. They consist of enhancing the State Department's efforts to construct Consulates overseas, a

combination of foreign missions, which are mandated through the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961, which is a treaty, and authorized by the 1982 Foreign Missions Act, and doing -- supporting DOS commitment for sustainable design.

This is supposed to be a cost-neutral development, supporting foreign missions plans for federal -- for facilities that reflect their individual cultures and optimizing the land use on the campus.

The staff finds that the goals are appropriate and recommends that the Commission support them, as they align with the policies within the Foreign Missions and International Nations element of the comprehensive plan.

So, the comprehensive -- excuse me, the concept plan is shown in this slide. The State Department included three lot development alternatives under the draft master plan to provide flexibility for the re-development of the Foreign Mission Center.

The State Department is using its experience at the International Chancery Center, or ICC, which established specific lot sizes within the overall campus.

The draft FMC master plan is building in the flexibility with this master plan, to be able to accommodate chanceries and the final lot configuration will depend on the demand from the -- from foreign countries.

While these options include different assumptions about retaining existing buildings on the FMC campus, the basic street configuration and open space you see on this slide remains the same for each option.

The next three slides, I'll show these options. They are basically the -- the lot development for -- under three scenarios. One scenario has 11 lots, one has 13 and the last has 15 lots.

So, the first with 11 lots is shown here. It retains the historic buildings, Building 40, Building -- excuse me, Building 41, which is

the Red Cross Building, Building 40 and Building 57, as well as some non-historic buildings, as well, due to larger buildings on the site that are -- can be used for -- by chanceries.

The second option is for 15 lots, and it assumes -- the major change here really is assuming that Building 40 would be demolished, and that lot would be divided into two lots for -- for redevelopment, and the other buildings would remain on the -- on the site from the previous option.

Then finally option three would also be to -- demolishing Building 40, in addition would be demolishing two existing buildings to the south of Building 40 located on these lots here, 14 and 15, and these are again, not historic buildings, but they are existing on the site.

Staff believes that -- any of the three options would result in the appropriate amount of development on this site and recommends that the Commission supports the State's vision for the Foreign Mission Center to develop the northwestern

portion of the former Walter Reed site, as a campus designed with -- designed lots leased to Foreign Missions for individual chancery use, in a manner similar to the existing International Chancery Center.

The plan is using the following as the organizing factors. Included in them is the ability of this campus to align with the development proposed on the remainder of the former Walter Reed site. Staff notes that the District of Columbia has developed the plan for eastern — the eastern portion of the former Walter Reed site that consists of a mid to high-rise mid-use development. The remaining portion of the former Walter Reed site will be used by the National Children's Hospital.

Connectivity is an important factor in this concept. Re-connecting some of the streets, including re-connection of Dahlia Street and re-connecting Main Drive to the -- the street network is important.

Re-envisioning 14th Street, this

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

assumes being actually a -- more of a -- a parkway with a bio-retention included in the -- toward the middle of it. The actual relationship between Building 1 and Building 40, as well as the connection of Building 41. They are included in the -- in the plan, at least one option of the plan, and maintaining the integrity of the building between Memorial Chapel and the Dahlia and 14th Street intersections.

We are encouraged by the moves that the State Department is proposing and -- excuse me, and we will be -- I can't get the mouse to move here.

We're encouraged that these moves will increase connectivity in this part of the District, as well as seek to maintain the visual actual connectivity between the existing historic elements on campus and the proposed campus.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission support the DOS plans for low-density chancery development and scale with the surrounding neighborhood, provide Foreign Missions suitable development sites and protecting

in the existing historic resources by re-purposing some of the existing historic buildings.

Now, we move to the specific topic areas that I mentioned earlier.

First is a recommendation to encourage the State Department to preserve as many of the historic buildings as possible that are contributing elements to the Walter Reed Army -- Walter Reed Historic District, to help preserve its integrity.

To encourage the State Department to preserve Buildings 40, 41 and 57, as they are contributing elements to the Walter Reed Historic District and described as being suitable for reuse on the campus in the master plan, and recommend that if Building 40 is demolished, the proposed development should maintain the actual align -- excuse me, axial alignments and symmetry that exists with Building 1.

Staff reviewed the Comprehensive
Transportation Review or CTR that the State
Department submitted with the draft master plan,

as well as two letters that the District Department of Transportation submitted on the CTR, or comprehensive transportation review.

Among the comments DDOT noted that the State Department should re-connect 14th Street north to Alaska Avenue. That's this connection here. This would help distribute vehicles arriving and leaving from the Foreign Missions Center, and staff is in agreement that the cul-de-sac does not help re-connect the campus to the neighborhood, and therefore, recommends that the State Department explore connecting 14th Street to Alaska Avenue, to complete the street network in this part of the District.

As it noted earlier, the State Department is using the ICC experience to provide guidance for this campus. The State Department has had to address on-street parking at the International Chancery Center, and some of the Foreign Missions have requested greater stand-off from their buildings, and as you can see here, they put in place measures here and here, to restrict

on-street parking from in front of their facility.

So, the State Department is proposing streets without on-street parking, and you can see that in this rendering here on the left, as well as the images here, the sections here on the right-hand side of the slide.

Staff understands that the security concerns and recommends that the Commission support the DOS recommendation of no on-street parking at the FMC, due to security concerns.

So, the State Department is also proposing a one to one parking ratio at the FMC. While we are reviewing the master plan in accordance with the comprehensive plan, the -- the development of international -- excuse me, the development of individual chanceries is bound by the Vienna Convention Treaty, as well as the Foreign Missions Act.

This legislation and treaty requires reciprocity between countries and simply that's -- that we will allow the -- allow inside the U.S., but we will be allowed to construct in other

countries, and for security reasons, the United States needs to provide parking at overseas facilities for all of the staff, and therefore, we will need to allow to do the same here.

Not only -- not only are we bound by this treaty and this legislation, it needs to be stated that these are not U.S. Government employees, but foreign guests and representatives of foreign countries, and therefore, in this unique situation, the treaty and the FMA take precedence over the comprehensive plan.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission support the one to one proposed parking ratio, but also requests that DOS encourage the Foreign Missions that develop at this campus to improve the parking ratio where possible.

The State Department is proposing -excuse me, the staff encourages DOS to incorporate
policies contained in the Foreign Missions and
International Organizations Element and the -- and
the Urban Design Element of the comp plan,
regarding the appropriate use of ballards, delta

barriers, guard houses and fencing -- excuse me, fencing at federal facilities in an urban setting.

So, now we get to the lot development guidelines, and the State Department has included how to -- possibly how to develop individual lots.

They have in their guidelines, three zones, and these zones are shown here, the Chapel zone, Dahlia Street zone and Main Drive zone, kind of north, middle and south.

We find that the density scale in most of the proposed set-backs are appropriate, given that this is a transitioning neighborhood, that would include mixed-use enclave, and this is just an example of what they've provided.

There are a number of images included in the draft master plan that include potential development configurations on a lot by lot basis. Each lot would include development parameters, including lot coverage, floor area ratio or FAR, height set-backs, the number of buildings, driveway entrances, etcetera.

Staff has a few comments on these, and

I'll be providing these in this portion of the presentation, and in this image, I'll just point out that the plan should seek to try to keep consistent building lines for streets where the buildings aren't close to the street, and you can just see the -- the building lines seem to kind of jog over on both the northern portion of 14th Street as well as Dahlia Street, and therefore, staff encourages DOS to create a consistent building frontage at these streets on the campus.

As the visitor parking for the chanceries is located in the front yard, staff thinks that this may be -- need to be screened and maybe better moved out of the yard and maybe onto a side yard, and therefore, staff recommends that the State Department encourage Foreign Missions to place parking either on the side or behind one side of the proposed chanceries.

With regard to lots -- Lot 12, you see

Lots 12 and 13 here, since both of these lots are

-- and other lots kind of west of 14th Street are

in that remnant forest area, the staff recognizes

that the existing tree canopy and replacement trees are important, and therefore, staff encourages DOS to maintain as much of the existing remnant forest as possible, as these individual sites are developed and if trees have to be removed, staff requests that DOS ensure replacement trees follow the policies within the comprehensive plan.

As you can see on this photo on the right-hand side, it's a photo looking up -- this is 16th Street in this image, the left hand portion of the slide -- of the photograph, and Main Drive is the road that you see that's kind of -- that's blocked off.

This view will be the main view that visitors see, as they travel up 16th Street and enter into the Foreign Missions Center. Given the prominence of this site, staff requests that the State Department add additional detail in the guidelines for Lot 12 to engage Main Drive more appropriately, as this property will serve as the main entrance for the campus from 16th Street.

Some of the other lot development is

shown on this slide in Lots 14 and 15, on the eastern side of 14th Street. Lot 14 appears to be a fairly large lot, and if the building which is not historic is -- could -- is removed, maybe this could be some -- sub-divided into larger -- into a smaller lot.

Staff therefore, recommends that the Commission encourage DOS to establish additional guidelines for Lot 14 or consider separating it into two lots, which would then be more consistent with other lots within the Foreign Mission Center.

that, it is the With executive director's recommendation to support the Department of State vision for the Foreign Mission Center in Northwest Washington, D.C., support the goals with that draft master plan, which are identified here, support the development which is in scale with the surrounding neighborhood and context.

Note that NCPC is reviewing the draft master plan under the Planning Act and individuals sites on the Foreign Mission -- Foreign Missions Act criteria outlined in the MOA that was executive

-- excuse me, that was executed between State and National Capital Planning Commission on February 27th, reminds the State Department to update the draft master plan to reflect this newly signed MOA.

Note that D.C. and the National Children's Hospital will develop the rest of the former Walter Reed Army Research Center, and finally, to address the more specific comments regarding historic preservation, transportation, security and lot development guidelines when it comes in for final review, and since I've gone over these recommendations, I'm not going to read that, so that will be -- I'll conclude my presentation, and I'm available to answer any questions, and the State Department is here -- representatives from the State Department are here, as well.

[INSERT - FOREIGN MISSIONS CENTER MASTER PLAN
AT THE FORMER WALTER REED MEDICAL CENTER]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, Mr. Hart, very much. Before we discuss among ourselves, we have two here today for public comment that we can welcome.

[INSERT - LIST OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Public commenters, if you're representing a group, you have five minutes.

If you're speaking as an individual, you have three minutes.

The first up is Mr. Edmund Atkins, speaking on behalf of Shepherd Park Citizens Association. Is Mr. Atkins here?

Welcome. Please step up to the microphone and identify yourself and we're happy to hear from you.

MR. ATKINS: Thank you very much. Excuse me, I'm getting over a cold and I have a little touch of bronchitis, as well.

Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks very much for this opportunity to speak before your group today. I am Edmund E. Atkins, representing the Shepherd Park Citizens Association.

Our neighborhood is composed of stately homes of various styles and sizes, and is immediately adjacent to the Walter Reed site on its northern side.

Representatives from Shepherd Park and

other nearby neighborhoods, such as Brightwood and Takoma Park, were active participants in the planning process for developing this Walter Reed plan, including the area presently under the control of the United States Department of State.

While we are in -- are generally in agreement with the master plan's goals, objectives and implementing strategies, we do differ on one specific item, which I wish to discuss very briefly with you today, and that is the policy for the reuse of Building 57, the Chapel.

The January 2017 draft plan report notes, and I quote from page 3-33, "Completed in 1931, Memorial Chapel was constructed with donations raised by the Red Cross' Gray Lady Corps, a group that provided recreational services at military and Veterans hospitals. The Chapel is built in the English Country Gothic style, which differs greatly from the Georgian Revival style of the rest of the campus."

"Its original use was as a non-denominational -- denominational worship

space for Walter Reed patients, staff, visitors and the surrounding neighborhoods." I want to emphasize that, and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Building 57 is individually eligible for listing on the National Historic Preservation list and a contributing resource to the proposed Walter Reed Historic District.

Due to a significance to the Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the surrounding community, the Department of State will retain the Chapel in this current site, which is a good thing in my opinion.

"Due to its size, configuration and style, the Memorial Chapel is not recommended for reuse as a chancery. The recommended reuse is an event and assembly venue for Department of State and Foreign Missions with chanceries the Greater Washington, D.C. metro area."

As a retired

State Department Senior Foreign Services Officer with 30 years in the Diplomatic Service, I am certainly sympathetic that the concerns that the

Department's Office of Foreign Missions and Diplomatic Security have for maintaining a strict security posture on this site.

That said, the fellow citizens in surrounding neighborhoods and the city as a whole certainly merit an opportunity to use the Chapel for such community events as weddings, meetings and assemblies, consistent with this original use dated from 1931.

For example, each group desiring to use the facility should be vetted by appropriate people at the Department of State. They could present an application well in advance to DOS to Department of State, Diplomatic Security, OFM Office of Foreign Missions, who after due diligence would then include them on a master list of organizations approved for using the facility.

Of course, each event would need a guest list for review by security professional and/or representative before entering the facility.

Furthermore, the Chapel is well located to serve the general community. It will be readily

accessible from Dahlia, 16th Street Northwest and

14th Street Northwest, and will not disrupt ongoing

chancery operations onsite, since many, if not all

events will occur on the evenings and on the

weekends.

Finally, we believe the Department

should open the Chapel to all D.C. residents as it

was from 1931 until recently. Such a gesture would

go a long way toward cementing community support

for the project and most importantly, demystify the

Foreign Missions area.

We, from Shepherd Park Citizens

Association encourage the NCPC to include this

principle in its final comments to the Department

of State. Thank you very much, ladies and

gentlemen, for the opportunity to address this

August body today.

[INSERT - STATEMENT OF EDMUND ATKINS]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, Mr. Atkins, very much.

Second we have Ms. Rhonda Ferguson-Augustus. Yes, welcome.

MS. FERGUSON-AUGUSTUS: Thank you for this opportunity. I'll be brief.

My colleague has certainly said all you needed to hear. I want to give you the southern side of the property's opinion. We're a little bit smaller, but we are certainly vested in the future of Walter Reed.

I bought into this community 30 years ago, when I joined the Foreign Service. There are a lot of us up there, and part of my interest in the area was Walter Reed, which used to be open to the community. It is sorely missed.

I totally agree and appreciate the security concerns. Having lived overseas for most of my 30 years in the field, I can attest to the need for that security.

However, I can also attest to the value of having a neighborhood open and embracing this

proup that is coming in on behalf of the State Department. We are willing and interesting in embracing them. It is much harder to do so if we have no access and no opportunities to engage.

So, on behalf of those who aren't here,

I would encourage you to support the
recommendations that Mr. Atkins submitted to this
committee, and consider leaving a little part of
Walter Reed open to the rest of us. Thank you very
much.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you very much. We will bring the matter back to Commission for discussion, and I have a couple of questions, Mr. Hart.

Can you tell us a little bit more about Building 40, its condition, its potential for reuse? Whether it stays or goes seems to contribute some to whether you have 11 lots or 15.

So, it's not an insignificant building, but can you tell us a little bit more about it?

MR. HART: Yes. The State Department, and they're here, they can -- they know much more

detail than I do but --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Sure.

MR. HART: -- to give you a little --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: The question is extended to them, as well.

MR. HART: Yes. Building 40 has -- is in fair -- fair to -- portions of it are in poor condition.

But the issue with the building is part, about the condition. But also part about just the program of the building.

It's a massive building for the chancery use. Chanceries look to a much smaller footprint, and so, it -- it is unclear as to -- for the State Department's purpose, they've stated that it's unclear as to how multiple chanceries might be able to use the -- that building, because of its configuration.

There are two bars you see -- well, sorry. There are two bars that are kind of south and north, and this is an auditorium space that's kind of in the middle of them, and so, it's a little

difficult to kind of figure out how those work together in tandem and how someone could actually use that and I'll invite the State Department up here to give further -- or their consultant to give further clarification of that.

But it is difficult problem, because of the -- the lack of the ability to be able to reuse it for the chanceries, and then some issues with the actual condition of the building.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes, it's a grand building, but I appreciate the challenge.

The other question I have is regarding off-street parking and while I appreciate the security needs and the lessons learned from the ICC, I know that ICC chanceries, it's not uncommon to have public events or lectures or small concerts and those kinds of things, I myself have used the on-street parking on occasion.

Where these potential chanceries will have large events --

MR. HART: How are they going to do it?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: -- what will be the

parking situation?

MR. HART: Yes, I'll ask the State Department to come up here, the representatives from them too, to respond to that, and I'm not sure who is -- who wants to do that. Looks like the hot seat. If you could introduce yourselves, folks, please.

MR. BODNER: Good afternoon. My name is Adam Bodner. I'm the Director of the Office of Real Property Management in the State Department, and with me is our consulting team from EYP.

MR. HART: The question is for events, how do -- how are events large, small handled in terms of parking for -- at the Foreign Mission Center.

MR. CARROLL: Hello. My name is Sandy Carroll. I am a consultant to Department of State.

Large events at the -- most of the large events occur in the evening hours. So, one potential resource is the parking at the -- that each chancery will have within their building.

Another resource is, if you look, the

large, red building is Building 54. Adjacent to that, the large grey building is Building 3 which is a 1,200 space parking garage that the Children's National Medical Center will continue to leave — to use. That will — is also intended to be a resource for the entire historic district.

In addition, the DCLRA development will have a structured parking just east of that, under what is now the site of Building 2, the main --

MR. HART: Can you just let them know what the DCLRA is?

MR. CARROLL: Sorry, the District of Columbia Local Re-Development Authority, or they also do the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, local redevelopment authority. I just have a couple names.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes, so the garage at the hospital site will be available for others than

MR. CARROLL: It actually is oversized, based on what we understand that the Children's -- how the Children's National Medical

Center intends to reuse Building 54 and the other buildings, it's -- it appears to be grossly oversized for their intent for their space use, which is a benefit, not just to the Foreign Mission Center, but also to the rest of the redevelopment of the Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes, right. That's helpful to that.

I guess just my last question before I open it up to others is --

MR. CARROLL: Actually, I'm not -- I hazard a point. We understood that it might be on the larger side, but the Children's National Medical Center probably could speak more clearly about the --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Sure.

MR. CARROLL: -- exact use of that building.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: I guess my last question is, we had seen past large projects that are abutting neighborhoods, that there is an agency liaison to the neighborhood, and it's their plans

to have a designated person and line of communication with the neighborhood on issues such has been raised.

MR. BODNER: Yes, yes, and that would be our Office of Foreign Missions.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Okay.

MR. BODNER: They're always available. We do the same thing with -- at the International Chancery Center, as well.

MR. DIXON: Mr. Chairman, first, it's interesting to see this project. I was the council member when we built Walter Reed, and now, I'm seeing it taken down, so I guess --

So, but I'm am very pleased to hear from Shepherd Park and the community south of the area, that were very kind to me when I was trying to do my job in those days.

One thing I am concerned a little about is the trees that separate, I guess it's Alaska from the other -- from the area have been a nice buffer for that -- for those houses and those people who live there.

So, I hope as you develop that site, you will try to keep at least the foliage as much as you can, to keep that buffer, that softness that was nice to look out of your house and see, I think from that community. So, that.

I also, I guess collectively would say,
I hope we can incorporate without any energy from
the Commission really, some of the ideas that were
presented by Mr. Atkins, because I think they make
a lot of sense, as it relates particularly to the
Chapel.

I remember when, many years ago, there
-- we had a lot of access to Walter Reed and it was
really our community amenity that -- with the
military there. So, I hope that can be continued.
I think it's valuable.

I also know that there was a long -- it's been a long time, we've been -- this is kind of a question, looking at places to put smaller countries that are less affluent, in terms of building these -- building out these kind of areas, and I also remember that I used to work at WTI when

we were -- where the now the new -- the chanceries are now on -- off of -- off of Wisconsin -- off of Connecticut Avenue.

So, but there is always these big spots that people have resources come -- countries that have resources, can move into, whereas, your less affluent countries are often forced into communities where they may not be as well received and they don't have parking, etcetera, etcetera.

So, this Building No. 40 in particular, may not be used -- may not -- may not be retrofitted, but it could be -- maybe the facades can be kept in some way and maybe that could be a place where you -- you might be able to increase your number of facilities there by -- by adding a place for maybe multiple countries to be, and you might get back to your lots numbers which you're trying to accommodate.

So, that's only just a thought because and -- I think it could be -- maybe it can be useful. I don't know.

Last thing I would say, and that's a

question, whether you might be able to do that, I don't know.

The last thing is a -- to tell you that we're already at east of the river, for you to bring a -- this kind of a project to us. We would welcome foreign countries coming over, and being part of our community and bringing their -- their -- their presence in our neighborhood. So, we got some land to work with, I think. Thank you, and I'll wait for an answer to the question about the multi-use.

MR. BODNER: Sure. One thing on the general access to the site, so that the Commission is aware.

The site itself is open. The roads will be open. The bike lanes. The sidewalks. So, the Chapel idea can be further discussed with the community, as the process moves forward, but it's going to be much more open than it is today.

MR. DIXON: Good.

MR. BODNER: The Building 40 suggestion, I think the intent of the department is to -- is to advocate for its use with foreign

countries to the best of our ability, and of their ability to use it in some way, and through that process, I think we'll prove that it either does or does not meet the purpose and needs of the -- of the activity.

So, we're going to try. It's just that -- like you said, it's an enormous facility and it's in very poor condition.

MR. DIXON: Yes.

MR. BODNER: But we are --

MR. DIXON: And even if you took that down and you replaced it with a structure that maybe kept some facade, so the historical thing is there.

But if you could get a bunch of countries that may be interested in less expensive property for their purposes --

MR. BODNER: Right.

MR. DIXON: -- and off -- out of the communities.

MR. BODNER: Right, right, understand.

MR. DIXON: You understand. I think

it's --

MR. BODNER: Thank you.

MR. DIXON: Thank you.

MR. HART: And Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Dixon, sorry. The -- there is also a parallel process going on right now through the Section 06 process, and there may be some, you know, opportunity for, I don't know, mitigation or whatever, as part of that.

So, you know, we'll keep that in mind, as we're going through that process, as well, and I've heard the comments that you all have made and we're free to come to the Section 06 meetings about historic preservation and I'm -- we haven't scheduled the next one, but they will be coming up. So, that may be an opportunity to do that, as well, and regarding the buffer, there is a -- Commissioner Dixon, there is a buffer that's about -- about a 50 foot buffer, actually, along Alaska that is going to be maintained for the length of the road, and they're looking to maintain -- I mean, they did a tree survey for the site, which is fairly

exceptional, and it's -- so, it's helpful that they've actually gone through that process to identify the heritage and noteworthy trees.

They do note that there are some trees that are, you know, not -- they're in bad condition or for whatever reason, they could be removed, but they do understand where those things are. So, that information is helpful.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Ms. Wright?

MS. WRIGHT: This -- this -- the word I -- that keep -- I'm trying to be restrained. It feels

schizophrenic to me, this plan, and I get that there are conflicting priorities, but here is -- and then I'm going to cede my time to Mr. Gallas, because he has notes, and we agree about these things. So, he'll be a lot more articulate than I am.

But it -- it feels a little -- there's

-- there is these -- there are these competing

interests of restoring the street grid and opening

up this part of the campus, or reopening and that

all seems to make perfect sense to me, and would

dictate these rather -- especially in Option C, where there is 15 lots and there's these rather, you know, grid-like lot lines, that all makes sense.

But then there's this kind of weird gesture with 14th Street, which I don't understand at all.

The impulse seems to be to again, restore along front street, but then -- and I get that you can't restore the -- a grid, because you've got some significant buildings in the way.

But then you end in this cul-de-sac, and so, I would ask what's the point, either from an urban design perspective, or even a transportation perspective? That's it, because he's got notes. Go.

MR. GALLAS: Can I?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Gallas.

MR. GALLAS: Thank you. It's always difficult to follow you, with your eloquence.

Yes, and I was particularly struck by Ms. Ferguson-Augustus' commentary about a

community open and embracing the Foreign Service, and I too was drawn by -- maybe we could go to -- what is it? Either slide -- well, this will do.

So, that's that cul-de-sac that we're talking about at 14th Street, where it's moving north and south and it just stops, and it would seem like if we're trying to open up this campus, we're dealing with security, not this way, but through individual building security, building by building, and I think that's been very clear, that not opening up that connection seems to also, in a way, insult the community to the north, in terms of wanting access to say, the Chapel, which is some of what we're also hearing.

So, if the overall goal -- and I think I've heard it as such, is to open Walter Reed up and have it be part of the fabric of the community and have it be connected to its surroundings, so it's no longer a campus, this still feels like -- this particular move still feels like it's -- still wants to be a campus.

I have one other connectivity comment

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and then maybe we could take a break, so, I'm -- and then I have more questions after that.

But and then if you could go to slide 37. This is the other street that seems to be forming east to west. See the one at the top of the screen here? It's sort of -- I think you -- well, it's sort of in the middle, just above Lots 12 and 13 there.

MR. HART: Yes, there is not -- there is no street there.

MR. GALLAS: There is no street there? What is that?

MR. HART: This -- there is Dahlia -- I'm trying to get out of this.

MR. GALLAS: No, no, no. I'm not talking about Dahlia. I'm talking just above lots

MR. HART: You said here.

MR. GALLAS: -- 12 and 13. What is that?

MR. HART: That's just a -- basically a lot line.

What the State Department did was they created set-backs for where the buildings really should not be located or will not be located, and so, that's just the set-backs along a property line between two lots. It's not a street that's suppose to be indicated on the plan, even though it does kind of look like one. It's not.

MR. GALLAS: Thank you for clarifying.

MR. HART: Okay.

MR. GALLAS: If you have any comments on it.

MR. HART: Yes, I can give you a little bit of the conversation that we've had, and one of the recommendations that we have included is about 14th Street.

We had a similar -- staff had a similar kind of reaction to that, and the State Department has -- they're still under -- they're still in the EIS process now, and what they have indicated to staff is that they are willing at least have the road 14th Street go -- continue up to Alaska, so kind of include this piece as part of the options

for -- under the EIS.

So, I think that that's helpful to at least understand what that -- what that might be. What we've been -- what has been explained to us is that this decision was really made because there were some folks in the neighborhood that were somewhat hesitant about having a connection. Maybe there is going to be some thru-traffic and the issues with that.

DDOT has suggested that it's helpful to have more entrances and exits to the site because then you can kind of distribute the traffic a little bit better and so, we're hopeful that we can get the 14th Street connection all the way through, because I think it's more of a suburban model than it is -- and a campus model, than it is the part of a -- of an integrated street network.

So, we're -- staff is -- is in support of that, and that's why the recommendation is there.

I'll also note that there was an issue about the lot development and trying to maximize

the amount of space for the lots, and the way that the road configuration went in this portion, it seems as though it was more lot for the cul-de-sac than it would be if you had a road going through, and it's just kind of the alignment of where 14th Street, because it has to do a little jog to get to Alaska and then continue on 14th Street.

It was just some -- you know, some issues, but I think the State Department is at least willing to consider the 14th Street option again -- the through 14th Street option again. So.

MR. GALLAS: It would seem that, you know, having that 14th Street come all the way through the old main drive, is a lovely way to embrace the community and vice versa, and I think — I mean, I don't want to be unsympathetic to the community in this regard, but I think if you live in the city, it's about connection and connectivity and the grid of the city.

So, overall I expect the community would see the benefit of that connection.

MR. HART: And I'll note, and I agree

with that. I think we've had discussions. I think that we're in agreement with that as well.

The one thing that I didn't discuss really was about the pedestrian bike connections. They are -- regardless of if this is a cul-de-sac or a straight-thru, there is a bicycle pedestrian connection that would connect up to Alaska.

So, that connection would still be there, so people could actually still -- they didn't have go down to Dahlia, you know, to get into the site. They could actually walk through the -- that connection into -- down to the Memorial Chapel, if they'd like.

MR. GALLAS: So, just to be clear, it's more the community's desire for it not to be connected than it is the Department of State, is that --

MR. HART: I think there's a little both.

MR. GALLAS: -- what I'm hearing.

MR. HART: They can certainly answer for themselves.

MR. CARROLL: This project as you -- as Carlton had mentioned before, he mentioned -- we noted that the project -- the site was larger before, at which time we went through the draft EIS process, and we received several comments from the community during the draft EIS public comment period, expressing concerns about 14th Street becoming a cut-through.

Heavy traffic on 16th Street seemed the -- more so, maybe not as much the Foreign Mission community, but the other adjoining commercial and retail development on the D.C. -- on the rest of the Walter Reed campus, using 14th Street as a shortcut to get around the 16th Street or Georgia Avenue traffic.

That was what we had heard during that public comment process, the public hearing and the comments.

So, part of our reaction was that, and as he mentioned also the concern is too, is this neutral cost idea as maximized in the amount of land.

As he also mentioned, we are still evaluating that based on comments that we received from the NCPC. We also have received similar comments from CFA and DDOT, as has already been mentioned.

MR. GALLAS: Okay, then I'll just conclude by suggesting that I think five, 10, 20 years from now when we'll -- we'll remember the good parts of Walter Reed, but we'll also see not see as part of the city as open, and part of its connected grid.

I think it would be -- it would be advisable to look very carefully at opening that up for access to the community.

Can I switch to another topic? Mr. Hart, you didn't dwell on this too much, but I do my homework and read some of the materials you sent us, and there's a part in here I got a little confused about. It's under the category of the executive summary.

It's one of the bullet points that talks about support the desire of Foreign Missions to

build significant facilities that reflect the character and ethos of their native architectures.

Then sort of on the next page, as it relates to historic preservation, there is a bullet that says, "Ensure that chanceries located in historic districts are respectful of the architectural character established by the District."

So, it seemed to me, and Ms. Wright could read my comments here, it says contradicts.

Seems to me those two comments --

MS. WRIGHT: Is that the same as schizophrenic?

MR. GALLAS: Almost, yes, right, and so, I guess I'm wondering which one is it and how do we -- how do you see going forward with that piece?

MR. CHALIFOUX: My name is Matt Chalifoux. I'm also principal with the EYP and Historic Preservation Architect.

In terms of design controls for new construction in this, we're using two tools. We're

referencing the standard design guidelines that are available through the District Historic Preservation Office and we're working with the Historic District. So, Secretary of the Interiors standards, all that kind of good stuff, and then were are also developing kind of augmented design guidelines that are specific to Walter Reed, that talk to the point about, well, what is significant about this site? What are the materials massing the kind of critical issues and character defining elements of those buildings?

I don't necessarily see those statements as contradictory, because in reality, the Secretary of Interior standards are meant to be wide open enough that a good architect, a good designer can think creatively and apply that creativity to what they're doing.

We're trying to provide enough of a framework that we're not being prescriptive to a designer, but also to give them good direction about what the expectations would be, so that there is some -- some, I don't want to say homogeneity,

but that there is some sense of community about what's happening in this.

So, we're really focusing on the types of materials are used, the way buildings are massed, obviously how they front a street, how they're set to kind of work within the neighborhood, and we're having ongoing discussions obviously through the master plan development process about are those guidelines strong enough? Do they need more language in them?

So, we're trying to balance those two aspects of it.

MR. GALLAS: Yes, I can appreciate the challenge. I'm not sure, is the -- is this comment about the character and ethos of their native architecture, is that part of the legislation that exists, or is that simply a goal?

MR. BODNER: I think I can answer that.

I think I'll say it's part of the reciprocity in general and how the nations project their individuality.

So, we're attempting to construct the

framework, as Matt alluded, but then within that, they then have the where-with-all to express their own individuality.

MR. GALLAS: Okay, well, I think I just would want to make sure we don't end up with the architect's petting zoo here, where we have one of everything. So, thank you for listening. Thank you, Ms. Wright.

MS. WRIGHT: Well, yes, so, I'll just take two seconds.

Towards that end, I mean, you can go to Potomac to see the architectural petting zoo.

I think that it's -- aside from the obvious things of sustainability, because you may end up with, you know, a -- however many acre tour of architectural history, it's really important for that reason too, to maintain the tree canopy, as you are doing.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Cash.

MR. CASH: I had a question. I wish Mr. Shaw as here. Maybe he could answer this better.

But in relation to the rest of the

campus, the District side, I was on the reuse advisory committee for a couple of meetings and I know one of the biggest concerns that I heard at a lot of those community meetings were related to transportation and about the influx of cars that will be coming through, either through cut-throughs.

But one of the things that I'm now wondering, hearing the one to one parking ratio,

I know you might not have any control over that,
but was that part -- was that one of the considerations in the District's transportation management study, just to see, I mean, if there's a one to one ratio, a lot more cars are going to be coming out of that campus then might have otherwise been there.

So, I guess my first question is, do you guys know if that was part of their transportation study and internally, what may be your own study shown, will be the effect on the traffic on the campus?

MR. ANDRES: Good afternoon. Erwin

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Andres with Gorove/Slade Associates. We're the transportation consultants on the team.

With respect to the one to one ratio, as has been stated before, this one to one ratio includes not only enough parking for employees on a daily basis, but also be able to accommodate visitors and different -- and different other users for each of the individual chanceries.

The intent is to not -- the intent is to promote as much as we can, a lower parking ratio, but still provide the chanceries the ability to provide one to one, in order to accommodate all those uses.

In coordinating with DDOT, DDOT understood this and actually asked us to analyze this one to one ratio, even though it is going to be on a higher end of the spectrum of the parking ratio, and in doing that, we've identified some mitigation measures that will be implemented with the development of this campus.

Yes, so, with respect to the coordination of the LRA, we're also the

transportation consultant on the LRA side.

So, the short answer is yes, we've coordinated really well with the DCLRA and all the transportation issues related to that.

MR. CASH: Well, thanks for that. Actually, that brings up one other question then.

So, the one to one ratio, I think that the presentation indicated that it was one to one for the employees of the missions, but this is actually for people that are going to be visiting them, and so, it's one to one visitors and employees?

Well, MR. ANDRES: it's our understanding that the one to one ratio includes both visitors and employees, and the reason for it is because given the security constraints on the visitor parking public roadways, no is accommodated on the public roadways. So, as a result, they need to be accommodated within the chanceries.

MR. CASH: So, given that there's trying to be some cost savings here, I mean, are

these going to be a lot of surface parking lots?

Do we have control over that, if that's what they
want to do, or is this going to be integrated into
the building plans?

MR. CARROLL: That's my question. Sandy Carroll again.

Our -- we have limited the amount of surface parking to six to 12 parking spaces, depending on the size of the lot. It is the responsibility of the Foreign Missions to locate the remainder of the parking and structure parking underneath the footprint of the building, similar to what is occurring on the ICC campus.

We believe that that is a reasonable solution. But it's also a proactive solution in helping reduce the parking count because underground structure parking is very expensive, and sustain-ability would help -- would help encourage people not to park there, but also the cost would help maybe to encourage each chancery to look at other measures of reducing their vehicle trips.

One thing that they've also asked as part of the chancery review and the design guidelines is that each chancery do its own transportation demand management plan, and that would be reviewed as part of the design review process of each chancery, with the understanding that, you know, if you are reducing your parking from that one to one ratio, how are you counter — how are you addressing these other trips that may occur to and from the chanceries?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. May?

MR. MAY: Yes, I have just a few quick comments. I don't think any of them are actually questions.

First of all, I agree with pretty much everything that's been said so far, and all the concerns about the plan.

With regard to Building No. 40, I don't know if it was -- and it looks like a building that might have been done in a series of additions, in which case it might be sensible to look at peeling off some of those, as a strategy to reduce the

overall size, if the size is too big for any single chancery, and even if it's not, even if -- but there is -- sometimes with a building that big, it's easy enough to do partial demolition.

The -- and with regard to the parking ratio, you know, one to one, I guess is probably not a huge concern from my perspective, if we could understand what the overall parking numbers are going to be eventually, and what we think those -- you know, how many cars are actually going to be coming to each of these 11 to 15 sites, particularly in the context of what's happening with the rest of the campus, because it's a lot more cars, I think to the east of this component.

Last thing I would just say, touch on something different, which is the -- that section of 14th Street with the big swale in the middle and you know, the sort of park-like setting, and you know, don't get me wrong, I love parkways.

But that very short segment with 20 feet of pavement one way, that's separated in each direction, is going to be like a freeway.

So, you know, people are going to pull off of Dahlia Street and they're going to hit 50 going down 14th, and I don't think you want that. I think you need to be thinking about a street there that is more like an urban street perhaps, or at least a street that doesn't, from its physical messages, being designed by very well-meaning civil engineers, but the road itself tells you to go 50. Speed limit signs aren't going to do anything for you.

Maybe it's just -- you know, maybe it's just a good place for a speed trap, but it's just -- it -- to me, it's just -- it screams high speed, even for a short distance.

So, I think you need to look carefully at that, because I think it -- and you know, the rest of it, having the swales and the separated sidewalk and all those things, it can be quite lovely. You might want to look at a separated multi-use trail, rather than keeping the cyclists with the cars. I don't know what the right solution is. Just -- it's -- I think people are

going to be going too fast. So, that's it.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Any other questions or comments?

MR. DIXON: I want to make just two points.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Please.

MR. DIXON: I think there should be a lot of community involvement in deciding what street you open up, because if you're used to like on Alaska, if you're used to people not going — coming out, you got a four-way section now. People are going to park, moving along, and lot of different history in that community, and if you're opening up other areas, then that impacts the community. Hopefully, they will be involved in that discussion and I'm sure they will be.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: One other question.

Are there any extraordinary storm water challenges, I mean, far beyond what would be challenging for a site like this anyway?

MR. ROSHAN-AFSHAR: Hi. Navid Roshan-Afshar, civil on the project.

It's pretty straight forward. I mean, the way that we're sort of sub-dividing this is addressing the common parcel components. DOS would address with mostly linear street storm water management controls, the green strip on 14th Street would be a significant portion of that storm water control.

Each individual chancery would then have its own requirements to meet the D.C. storm water management regulations.

In terms of existing conditions, there is sort of a drainage pattern that goes from the north side to the south, largely in line with where 14th Street's median is. That was one of the reasons why the medium was kind of opened up to recreate that historic -- I wouldn't call it a perineal waterway, but a historic swale that used to go down to the -- to the national parks.

But nothing -- you know, the intensity of developments largely intact with the existing conditions. The proposed conditions are about the same level of density and impervious area that the

existing currently have.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Thank you, and Mr. Dixon gets --

MR. DIXON: Yes, I just -- I feel that a lot of -- this is going to be coming to process visas, if the chancery is where you process your visa at, is that the case?

So, you got a lot of people coming in, not a lot, depending upon, who need a place to temporarily park and drop off and leave or wait.

I mean, that's, I'm assuming, being factored in by these facilities, by these chanceries. So, it's not just office people and visitors. These are people coming to get processed.

MR. BODNER: We are factoring that in.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Well, thank you.

This has been a good robust discussion, Mr. Bodner.

Thank you very much.

Is there a motion on the EDR?

MR. DIXON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved. Is

there a second?

MS. WRIGHT: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. Since seeing no further discussion, all in favor?

MR. GRIFFIS: I have one.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes, sir.

MR. GRIFFIS: Piece of discussion.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes, sir.

MR. GRIFFIS: It seems to me, hearing from my fellow Commissioners, that we had some additions to that motion, and I wonder if we aren't proposing to structure a recommendation that supports working with the community, to structure some access to the Chapel, and actually add some language onto 14th Street.

I mean, it seems to me, we're giving recommendations to a master plan. We've got a lot of comments. I don't see it in our motion at this point.

MS. WRIGHT: But these are -- we're just voting for -- to accept comments, right?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Just comments.

MS. WRIGHT: So, I am -- I can't speak for you. I've had -- we've -- I've made my comments. I don't feel the need to amend the EDR for my part. I don't --

MR. DIXON: Mr. Chairman, as I said when I spoke, I'm hoping that we will move forward with language that will include the involvement of the community in this process, and I think that maybe that will be enough but -- good enough.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: I think Mr. Bodner has created that and --

MR. GALLAS: And I think as it relates to the connectivity, that's already been commented on by the staff, and so, I am satisfied that -- and thanks for allowing us to --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: And just come back to us with the preliminary and we can amend it at -- we can amend it at --

MR. GALLAS: For finals.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It will come back to us for finals.

MR. GALLAS: Yes, the draft and final.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Yes, right. Okay, it's been moved and seconded. I think we're ready for a vote.

All in favor of the EDR as written say aye.

{Chorus of ayes.}

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Opposed, no? Thank you very much. Thank you, gentlemen.

ACTION ITEMS

GEORGE P. SHULTZ NATIONAL FOREIGN AFFAIRS TRAINING CENTER 2016 MASTER PLAN UPDATE

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: The last and still significant item on our agenda is Agenda Item No. 5B. It's approval of comments for the draft master plan for the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center in Arlington, and it is brought to us by DGS and the Department of State.

Okay, Ms. Sullivan.

MS. SULLIVAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

GSA in coordination with the Department

of State has submitted a draft master plan for the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center in Arlington, Virginia. They are seeking comments on the plan from the Commission today, and before I get started, I wanted to just point out, we have a just very slightly amended EDR in front of you.

All we did was clarify the ownership at the bottom, and I just wanted to read the two sentences at the bottom of page one and underline that we added -- we now establish that the property was transferred via Public Law 99-167 from the Department of the Army to the Department of State in 1985, and Public Law 99-93 gave GSA custody and jurisdiction of the site in 1985.

So, we just wanted to clarify that. That's the only change.

So, just a quick overview of the presentation. I'm going to touch on the facility location, many of us already saw it today, this morning on the field trip. The planning history for the site, existing conditions, then we'll walk

through the master plan proposal, the transportation management plan, staff's analysis of key planning issues, and then I'll conclude with our recommendations for the Commission.

The national foreign affairs training center is located in Arlington, Virginia at the intersection of Arlington Boulevard and George Mason Drive. It serves as the headquarters for the Department of State Foreign Service Institute, which provides language, cultural and educational training to foreign service officers from across the federal government.

GSA developed the first campus plan in 1989. They came in with an update in 2005, and are back now with another update that you have in front of you today, and with this submission, GSA has included the draft master plan, the transportation management and an environmental assessment.

So, the campus is divided into two distinct areas, the main campus which you see on your right, which totals approximately 65 acres in the west parcel, which is approximately seven

acres. The National Guard Bureau occupies the site that sits in between these two parcels, as you see there.

The current average daily on campus population is 3,218 people, which is comprised of 1,370 faculty and staff, and 1,848 students.

The entire campus complex including the National Guard Bureau is eligible for listing on the national register of historic places, as Arlington Hall Station Historic District, which has two distinct periods of historic significance.

From 1924 to 1942 it was operated as Arlington Hall Junior College, a girls' finishing school, and then from 1942 to 1989, as the headquarters for the Department of the Army's U.S. Signal Intelligence Service, and as I just mentioned, the property was transferred via Public Law 99-167, from the Department of the Army to the Department of State in 1985. Also in 1985, Public Law 99-93 gave GSA custody and jurisdiction of this site.

There are four original structures that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

still remain on the site, the Historic Old Main, which you can see right here, the two cottages to the north, and then also the gymnasium, which you see right here, and all of these function as classrooms and/or support facilities for the Department of State today.

Here is some images, just of those facilities, the existing gymnasium, the Old Main and then an image of one of the cottages.

So, the campus shown here in light pink is surrounded almost entirely by lower-density residential uses, which are shown in white and tan, and then park use is shown in light blue.

The campus itself has a variety of land uses, including several dedicated garden spaces and a range of natural and designed landscapes, as shown in light green.

The west campus, shown in yellow on the left, is publicly accessible recreational space that is maintained by Arlington County through MOA, and just a quick look at all the buildings on the campus.

You have the visitor center, shown here in purple. The cafeteria, in blue. The gymnasium in orange. The Old Main and historic quad in pink, and in yellow, this is most -- the bulk of the classroom space, and then the central utility plant is up in the northern part of the campus, and you see the cottages and the historic growth, shown in green, and then the childcare center down at the bottom labeled in dark pink.

So, the range of open spaces on the campus service as unifying elements, creating a garden campus for students that assist with teaching and language learning. As such, vegetation is grouped into exhibits and features an international garden at the south end of the campus.

In addition to educational purposes, the landscape also serves as storm water treatment and provides a larger ecological benefit through the use of pollinator species.

As we saw this morning, the campus is heavily landscaped with mature trees, especially

to the north, where the historic growth is located.

in Then terms of historic and environmental resources, you'll note red-dashed line represents the historic area on the includes campus which historic bridge, significant oak trees and the historic buildings that I discussed earlier, and you'll also notice the rain garden areas next to the surface parking lots, over here shown in light blue.

So, GSA and the Department of State set five goals for the master plan development, which include advancing projects from earlier master plans and continuing to support the foreign service institute programs, enhancing security to reflect current threat assessment levels.

Providing infrastructure projects to support security and training requirements, meeting historic preservation requirements for structures and landscapes, and complying with updated governmental standards, such as those associated with energy, health and wellness, accessibility and other environmental standards.

They applied -- GSA and Department of State applied several planning principles to the development of the master plan which you see here, campus structure and organization, development density, functional relationships of buildings and open space, landscape planning, historic resources, security planning storm water management and sustain-ability principles and goals.

Master plan proposes a 16 percent increase in campus population from 3,218 to 3,809 by 2025, with the majority of that change occurring among the student population. Faculty and staff is expected to remain relatively constant, and one of the reasons for the change in student population is that the Department of State is consolidating that offsite training classrooms from other regional locations.

So, the proposed additions to the campus are highlighted in yellow and include the new perimeter security fencing, shown with the --it's actually a line with a bunch of x's in yellow

throughout the campus.

I also want to note that the surface parking lots provide the required stand-off distance for many campus buildings.

In terms of new square footage, the largest addition is Building B, which you see here outlined in red, which will sit behind the historic gymnasium building, identified as D, right in front of it, and I'll talk about that more in a minute.

The yellow area G is an expanded central plant. F and K include additional classroom space. A is the expansion of the visitor center and L is the expansion of the daycare. All of these additions will add around 310,000 square feet, bringing the campus to just under one-million square feet in total.

So, here is a bird's eye view showing potential building massing and the proposed green roofs, which are shown in green. This is also a good perspective to talk about site constraints, in terms of development.

GSA and the Department of State were

very limited in terms of where they could place new development, not wanting to develop within the historic grove or the quad. They were also constrained by a fairly steep slope surrounding the back of the existing building, this area right -- sorry, this area right here, and the need for stand-off area for security.

The master plan is a continued emphasis on landscape. New buildings will incorporate green roofs and an outdoor classroom is proposed for the childcare center.

As part of the plan to enhance the landscape, several new trees will be added to the campus, as shown in dark green. Some of this will be to provide screening for some of the new development.

The master plan uses the site's topography to retain storm water for onsite infiltration and release into the stream to the south, which you can see very vaguely here, and they've included several storm water concepts, including a bio-retention basin, rain gardens and

a bio-swale.

Finally, the master plan emphasizes the extensive infrastructure for pedestrian circulation across the site, shown in green, and the vehicular circulation concept, which runs along the perimeter of the campus, shown in orange.

GSA is proposing to close the pedestrian trail, shown here, to the public because of security needs, and I'm going to talk a little bit more about that in a second. But really, the main purpose of this trail right now lets people access through here and here, to reach the west campus, which is recreation area.

So, GSA completed the TMP in November of 2016. It seeks to develop a program that actively fosters more efficient faculty, staff and student commuting patterns. It includes several strategies that encourage change in travel modes such as incentivizing car pools with preferential parking and/or reduced parking costs, increasing shuttle capacity during peak periods. They have shuttles that run from some of the student housing

to the campus itself.

Expanding existing bike parking and adding a capital bike share station to the south entrance, establishing routine surveys to measure progress and increasing awareness of flex hours and guaranteed ride home initiatives, and these are just a few of the many strategies that the TMP has.

There are a variety of ways you can access the site. By vehicle, you can enter through one of two gates on the campus via Route 50, right here, or via George Mason Drive, down on the south. The northern edge of the campus, up here, is about 1.3 miles from the nearest metro station, which is the Ballston metro, which is pretty much the same distance from Virginia Square Metro as well, and to the center of the campus, where most of the buildings are located, it's about a mile and a half.

There are bus routes along Route 50 and George Mason Drive and the Department of State provides a shuttle service, as I just mentioned, from some of the student housing to the campus.

Currently, the campus has 1,690 surface

parking spaces, resulting in a ratio of one space for every 1.9 employees or students and faculty. The master plan proposes a small reduction in spaces, about 24 because the land is needed for the visitor center expansion.

Since the population on the campus is proposed to increase by about 600 people, the resulting ratio is -- will be one space for every 2.3 employees, and the master plan sets a parking ratio goal of one to three over a five year time frame, and one to four over the next 10 years, which I'll talk a little bit more about in the next section.

So, staff's analysis of the master plan is pretty straight forward and has resulted in recommendations focused on three areas, impacts to historic preservation, trail access and the parking strategy.

So, as noted previously, the campus sits within the National Register eligible

Arlington Hall Station Historic District, and has four historic structures. There are also listed

and proposed historic districts to the east, west and south of the site.

The proposed five story building,
Building B, would sit directly behind and adjacent
to this historic gymnasium and would be visible
from areas on and off the campus.

While one floor of Building B would be varied to minimize impacts, NCPC staff and the Virginia SHIPO still have concerns with the potential impacts to the historic context of the gymnasium, as well as impacts to the adjacent historic districts, and here you can see the Barcroft Historic District shown in green and the proposed Alcova Heights Historic District in yellow. Building B would be visible from certain locations in the Barcroft Historic District.

As such, staff suggests the Commission recommend the visual impacts of Building B on the historic gymnasium and larger historic context are further minimized to the extent practicable, in consultation with the Virginia State Historic Preservation Office and other stakeholders.

Now, with regard to the parking ration, the comprehensive plan identifies a parking ratio of one space for every four employees in Arlington County, and as I just mentioned, that while the resulting parking ratio for the campus with this master plan will be one to 2.3, GSA and the Department of State have stated that through the implementation of the TMP strategies, they seek to improve parking ratios to a goal of one to three in five years and one to four over 10 years.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission notes that the applicant seeks to meet a parking ratio of one to four over the long term through implementation of its transportation management plan, which is consistent with the NCPC parking guidelines for this area of the National Capital Region.

Staff however, also recognizes that this goal would represent a significant reduction in the number of parking spaces. A one to four ratio would require a reduction of 714 spaces, resulting 952 still on the campus.

Because of the extent of the reduction, staff suggests the Commission request the applicant develop an action plan that outlines a phased approach to the reduction of onsite parking to meet -- to meet their stated goals.

Finally, as noted previously, there are series of pathways that traverse the campus, including a publicly accessible jogging bike trail at the south end that would be closed for security reasons under this master plan.

It was introduced that this trail here, shown in red, was introduced in 1980 -- in the 1989 master plan, to provide community access to recreational areas on the west parcel before neighborhood sidewalks were complete.

A route along the -- so, actually, so there were no sidewalks in this area. So, basically it allowed the community here to use the trail to come over here.

So, now, the sidewalks have been built and this new route, if this were closed, would add about 1,300 feet to the trip to the west parcel.

The adjacent community had expressed a strong interested in maintaining dedicated trail access, and it's our understanding that GSA and Department of State are working with Arlington County to figure this out.

As such, staff suggests that the Commission recommend the applicant work -- continue to work with Arlington County, to address community concerns related to the removal of this bike -- this jogging and bike trail at the south end of the site, including the exploration of strategies to maintain access on federal property or provide access on adjacent county property.

So, therefore in conclusion, it is the executive director's recommendation that the Commission support the stated goals of the master plan, recommend the visual impacts of Building B on the historic gymnasium and larger historic context are further minimized, to the extent practical in consultation with the Virginia SHIPO and other stakeholders recommends that the applicant work with Arlington County to address

community concerns related to the trail, and notes that the applicant seek to meet parking ratio of one to four over the long term, through implementation of its TMP, and request the applicant develop an action plan that outlines a phased approach to the reduction of onsite parking to make the short and long term parking ratios proposed in the draft transportation management plan, and with that, I conclude my presentation, and we have GSA and Department of State here to answer questions.

[INSERT - GEORGE P. SHULZ NATIONAL FOREIGN AFFAIRS
TRAINING CENTER 2016 MASTER PLAN UPDATE]

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Perfect. Thank you very much. We don't have any public comment signed up for this. So, questions or comments among Commission members or questions for the proposers?

Mr. May?

MR. MAY: Okay, so, it's good we have these recommendations up there. I think generally speaking, they hit a lot of the important points, certainly the supports and recommends one and two there.

When it comes to community concerns regarding the removal of the jogging bike trail, you know, I think that's pretty much all we can do, is continue them to work with the county, to try to resolve that, because it is, I think a significant amenity and one of the things that makes the campus potentially a very good neighbor. So, I think that's very important.

Certainly, the aspiration of getting to one to four parking ratio is vitally important and having an action plan to do that.

I think that there are two things that

are really glaring for me in the overall plan, and that is the one, the amount of surface parking, not necessarily the number of spaces, but how much of it is just on the surface.

Then the second thing is Building B, which when we were onsite and -- on the tour, and I'm very grateful to have gotten the tour, because I think it's much easier to appreciate what's being proposed here.

What's shown in the plans and the massing of that is really just very massive and over-powering to the buildings adjacent to it and it's sort of crammed in there.

You know, I've reviewed a lot of campus plans. I've got another campus plan review tonight, at the Zoning Commission. I feel like I have one, you know, every few weeks. That's an exaggeration.

But we see a lot of them, and we see of lot of campus plans where the campuses are highly constrained, and so, the only way to try to make it work is to make -- is to convert the campus, which

is a lot of individual buildings with a lot of green space and pathways and things like that, into something more like an urban environment.

The move that's happening here with Building B is much more like that. It's like -- I mean, that's what you would do if you were at Georgetown and you were trying to cram in an extra building, you know, sort of L-shaped building surrounding the historic building. It just feels like it's way too much mass right there.

I think there are opportunities to do things that are much more interesting, particularly given the amount of surface parking that is there. Surely, there are ways that that, you know, might sacrifice some of the surface parking for the sake of a building plot. That wouldn't take away that green space.

So, I think these are -- you know, there are -- the bad news is that it's not really great, what's being proposed. The good news is that there are a lot of options to look at, and I think that they should be -- we should strongly encourage to

look at different options for how that additional capacity might be integrated into the campus. So, that's my comment.

MR. GALLAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I really want to echo what Commissioner May just had to say, particularly about Building B.

I think that it does feel as though it's sort of being shoe-horned in, and that I couldn't help but wonder whether there had been exploration about what could be done with the surface parking lot, particularly the one opposite the side of the -- of the childcare center.

You know, I also feel as though the building is -- is sort of -- what's encroaching, I think was the word I was using, to -- into the quad.

I don't think the way it's -- sometimes you can add a building into the quad or at the quad's edge and help create containment of the space, and I think that maybe the notion that's being thought of here, I'd like to hear maybe some comment about that.

But to me and the direction and the way we've sort of seen the visuals here, it looks like it's more encroaching than it is trying to contain, and as such, it feels like it's wanting to almost drown out the gymnasium and Building D, like it isn't there, like we'll just cover it up and kind of ignore it, and maybe we won't know it's there.

So, I agree with Commissioner May, that I hope that it will -- there will be further explanation -- exploration about either the shape and massing of that building, or the possible use of the parking lot as a way to handle both the parking requirements, because certainly we can park underneath buildings as well.

As it relates to the rest of the master plan, I think all the other proposed expansions of buildings in A and K and F and G all feel comfortable. B just feels like it's trying to do a lot with a little bit too -- too little a space.

MS. SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify one thing.

Staff absolutely agreed with the notion

of it using -- you can see the parking -- surface parking lot and think well, why can't you just put your development there?

We were told, and maybe we can explore this further, but that area is necessary for stand-off and development cannot go into that area.

So, I am not sure exactly, you know, how much the stand-off distance has to be per se, maybe it can -- we can look at it in more detail with GSA and Department of State, but --

MR. MAY: Can you clarify that? Where are you talking?

MS. SULLIVAN: That the parking lots --

MR. MAY: That it can go.

MS. SULLIVAN: -- are used for stand-off.

MR. MAY: All of them? Yes, the big one on the lower left?

MS. SULLIVAN: Actually, all of them.

MR. MAY: But all right, so, where that red dot is right now is not --

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. MAY: -- does not appear to be -- I mean, are you -- where is the stand-off from? From George Mason?

MS. WRIGHT: Ada Bodner is going to address this --

MR. MAY: Yes.

MS. WRIGHT: -- because that seems like a good stand-off.

MR. BODNER: It is State Department day, isn't it?

Yes, the stand-off, it's extremely important to us, especially to this campus, which has been open for too long, in the minds of our security professionals.

The distance -- there is standards in the ICS criteria which is what we're seeking to uphold here, to the extent practical.

So, even on that lower lot there, you're just bringing yourself closer to George Mason.

MS. WRIGHT: So, for a level four facility, Adam, what would the actual linear footage be for stand-off?

MR. BODNER: I cannot give you a straight linear square foot right now. Did you have a straight up number?

MS. WRIGHT: Is it 150? But it's planned to be level four, isn't it? That's a surprise. I thought it was level four. Oh. So, that would be how much?

MR. MAY: So, that's going to be like 300 feet to where the -- well, at least 200 feet to where the red dot it, compared to George Mason.

MR. BERNARD: I'm John Bernard with Real Property, and the reason for it is the way the ring road works.

We could do exactly what you described.

We'd have to reconfigure the perimeter road -
MR. MAY: Yes.

MR. BERNARD: -- coming south, to do that.

MR. MAY: Yes, okay.

MR. BERNARD: Yes, that's possible, yes.

MR. MAY: Okay, we're good with that.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. BERNARD: I just wanted to explain how it was done and what impact it would have.

MR. MAY: Okay, I mean, I -- we certainly understand the stand-off. That comes up regularly, but I think that -- saying stand-off and actually showing how it works, and the circumstance is really what's necessary to make a decision to -- you know, to support a campus plan like this.

MR. BODNER: I'd like to introduce Chris Goldsmith, also from our -- from the campus.

MR. GOLDSMITH: So, it's wonderful to have you guys out today. It was a good presentation that we --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: You may regret having us out.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Yes. So, we did some extensive study on where we could place Building B.

Part of the discussion was to the least impact to the historic grove and the historic plot area. To us, that's pretty much off limits to any type of building.

Also, you know, the west parcel was another area of consideration, but again, stewards to the community, we do not want to impact what we have going on there with the MOA that we have, and as we've talked about stand-off, stand-offs, under the ISC, it's not really straight-forward. There's not 100 feet, 150 feet.

It depends on terrain, obstacles, you know, if you have a tree shed or other buildings, walls, that kind of thing.

So, it's a -- it's sort of not a definite number, but we could definitely work with our security folks to -- for that area, to see what it would entail.

But what I was trying to get at is, we did have a public scoping meeting. As you can see, the public is not here, because a lot of what we were presenting, they agreed with.

One of the largest sort of complaints or issues that they said that we'd like to look to address is view-shed.

They didn't want buildings right on the

property line, backing up to their property. We do have five or six houses here to the south, against that parking lot, and then a lot of the major community around the other parking areas.

They said one of the reasons was just privacy for them, and also the biggest thing was lighting. At night time, if lights were on and that kind of thing, to impact them.

So, we're trying to take into consideration those elements in coordination with the public, with the neighborhoods.

But as for Building B, you know, even looking at it, we agree there's some contextual elements that we can do. We talked about stepping back some of the floor levels up against the gymnasium, you know, and even as we continue to develop, just that configuration itself, we don't know if it really works for us.

But we do like that area because of that topography, with the steep slope in that area, it does actually give us an extra height by that underground lower level, so that we can keep the

overall height of the building to the surrounding areas minimal as possible to reduce the view-shed from the surrounding neighborhoods.

MR. GRIFFIS: Mr. Chairman, can I follow up on that?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Please.

MR. GRIFFIS: That was going to be my comment, because the selection of this site, I totally understood, especially standing there, was the fact that the grade changes so dramatically there as opposed to the flat surface parking, so you can tuck more building in to essentially, less relative height from the guad area.

I wonder if this graphic actually shows us a full picture of that in and of itself, and how much grade change there is, because if I'm not mistaken when we were there, I overheard a comment saying that the building was not going to have a relative height higher than Building D.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Yes, sir, that's our intention.

MR. GRIFFIS: So, we're reading as a

huge massive -- some of you are, anyway. I don't.

Huge massive building that I think actually --

MR. MAY: Can you see it there?

MR. GRIFFIS: I do see it right, there.

MS. WRIGHT: But I think the rendering does a disservice.

MR. GRIFFIS: Right, and in all seriousness, I think that kind of edge, I know this is just kind of massing, but that edge on the south side and having that lower step that actually is tucked within that, that little area, I think some tiering might be actually fascinating, as the architecture actually develops.

So, in any case, I think this actually fits well and starts to frame well, the quad, as opposed to dumping another building kind of across independent, kind of on a much more campus spread out feel. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. Gallas, the rebuttal?

MR. GALLAS: No, no, not to rebut, but I do hear the point about the grade, and I do

appreciate that, and that's where the site visit was very, very helpful.

My point about the historic quad and it's encroaching into the quad is that it does, at least in the way my eyes see this, looks as if it's saying let's hide Building D from the rest of the campus, and I feel -- I feel like I would like it better if Building D was still maintained its prominence. You don't have to necessarily love the building. I've seen worse, that's for sure.

But I feel like it's trying to change the character of the quad in a way that's not enhancing the containment of the space.

MS. WRIGHT: The location doesn't bother me as much as it bothers you, and I think the point of -- you know, the parking lot, I get why it ended up where it did.

I think the massing needs work, and could be reconfigured to embrace versus sort of alienating Building D.

You made a good point. It looks like it's trying to hide it. There a way around that,

I think in massing that could -- could make a more
-- a friendlier gesture, instead of what seems to
be a little bit of a hostile one.

MR. GRIFFIS: Another point that I would bring to this, as this building is being developed, I think what I learned today, and I think we all heard it was, this is such a functional campus as opposed to an architectural campus.

So, I am hesitant at all to give direction to what the building should look like, without fundamentally understanding how it's suppose to be utilized, and I think as that progresses, that may even inform a more interesting architectural piece that fits on that site.

MS. WRIGHT: Okay, I have to disagree with you. I think this campus -- the reason why this is so critical to get right is that it is a -- it is architecturally, pretty stunning, as it is, and does a pretty good job -- both the Mitchell/Giurgola and the Holabird and Root additions have been very respectful of the historic campus, but may get decidedly and interestingly

enough, for the time that it was designed in the late 80s, when we were still kind of mired and kitschy post-modernism, they decided to go a different direction, and I think the new -- the architecture of the new buildings really need to honor that.

This to me is really a robust architectural campus and needs to stay that way, but and that's the trick, to do -- be respectful of both the old and what -- well, 88 is not historic, but it -- it does -- it -- that -- that original complex I think really deserves respect, even though it's not historic yet. I hope certainly it will become historic.

MR. MAY: So, I think based on what we heard when we were out there, you know, I did understand that the way Building B was intended to be mass, was to -- was to defer more to -- to Building D and to get taller as you got closer to the ring road and that's what I understood.

But what we see, I think is so different from that. So, I mean, I think, you know, in some

ways with what Commissioner Griffis was saying initially about how it could work in that site, and I think it can work in that site. I think it can also work in a number of other sites. I think there are a whole range of ideas that can be examined here and I'm not necessarily, try to throw up everything for reconsideration.

But I do think it's important to look more carefully, I mean, at the very least, at the massing of the building, but also it's worth looking at other locations, even it isn't -- doesn't cross the ring road, I mean, you know, doing something that flanks the visitor building, so having that -- a -- you know, taking part of the mass of B and putting it on the other side.

I mean, there are lots of different ways to approach it. I'm not going to -- I don't want to try to redesign the campus for you, as much as I'd like to. But I actually was thinking in this circumstance, it might be worthwhile to add something to the EDR encouraging further examination of alternatives to the massing and/or

location of alternative B.

MR. GALLAS: Building B.

MR. MAY: Building B, sorry, Building B, and in fact, I've written something.

What do you think, Commissioner Wright?

Do you think it's worthwhile adding that to the EDR?

Something?

MS. WRIGHT: Okay, so this is -practically speaking, if you -- I wouldn't put up
a big fight over the massing language, but the
and/or location language gives me pause, because
now, we get practical and we get semi political and
we get into the reality of building this thing.

As usual, there is a schedule problem and the -- and to -- and I don't know if you heard some of these conversations this morning, but there is an urgency to get this done for political reasons.

MR. MAY: I understand urgency, and I'm not trying to slow anything down.

MS. WRIGHT: Right. So, I -- if we could -- if we could stick to the knitting of

massing, given the topography and I'm sure that what one of the not so small considerations in not going to the surface parking lots was also cost, and the -- you know, the usual.

MR. MAY: Right, so, I -- I guess I wouldn't necessarily want to force the point on location, but I also would not to close the door on it, because if you start to look at the massing and it doesn't fit, certainly it would be welcome for other alternatives --

MS. WRIGHT: So, could you -- could the language then be limited to further consideration of Building B, and not stipulate location and/or massing? Not stipulate --

MR. MAY: Well, so, what I was -- what I was thinking was that the Commission recommends that the applicant examine alternatives to the proposed massing and possibly the location of Building B.

MS. WRIGHT: Fine. I think we could live with that.

MR. MAY: With the intention to reduce

potential impacts on the historic quad and the natural area of the campus.

MS. WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. GRIFFIS: Can I make one comment on that, because I'm no expert in this, but I also heard a lot of conversations about the perimeter and security and how that was down the road and obviously needs to be upgraded.

We heard just today that there's security concerns as it's been more open. You start moving that building across, as it's my understanding, which is the visitor center, which is A, it's where people check in and check out, and now all the sudden, you've got a building far away from it, across a road.

To me, in my mind, how the heck do you secure this to make it also a nice campus feel? It seems to start raising questions, and I wonder if questions like this haven't already been answered, in finding the location for Building B.

MR. MAY: So, I mean, it may well have, and that's why I'm not forcing the point on B.

MS. WRIGHT: Well, I learned today from -- oh, somebody remind me of her name. What was the lady? Thank you, who showed us, when we got lost, and cut off from the rest of the group, we saw a model of the first -- of both the Mitchell/Giurgola and the Holabird & Root additions, and I did not know this, that Building B's location has been approved in two previous master plans.

So, I am assuming that it's been studied to death.

MR. MAY: So, I mean, it may just be a matter of sharing --

MS. WRIGHT: It might just be the massing.

MR. MAY: -- this so -- I mean, again, I'm not ready to force the point on location.

MS. WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. MAY: But certainly, you know, I think we want to make a statement about the massing if nothing else, and again, if that forces a re-examine of location, particularly in light of

perimeter security, which may well put, you know, force a -- you know, a relocation even of the visitor center, if you will, it's not really a visitor center. It's more of a screening center.

But because it -- you want to have that all the way at the -- at the perimeter. You don't want to have facilities like that --

MS. WRIGHT: Right.

MR. MAY: -- deep into the middle of it, and of course, we're not even looking at the particulars of perimeter security at this moment.

So, all of these things could change a little bit, as a result of that. So.

MR. GALLAS: Just -- I just wanted to add something to Commissioner Griffis' comment about, you know, the force protection and had that already been considered.

I kind of agree with Commissioner May, that you know, little things like well, if the -- if the ring road, the perimeter road were adjusted a little bit, you could still accommodate some of our concerns and not have it come all the way down

to the current parking lot or -- there's a lot of creativity that could be applied here, that could address some of the concerns we're -- we're expressing today.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Ms. White?

MS. WHITE: Speaking of perimeter security, the childcare is just a curiosity and some of the side conversations, understanding why it was put there at the time, and what those considerations were before you had the security concerns now.

So, I'd be curious to hear more about how you reconcile that. I mean, other than taking the jogging path out, because it -- it -- if you move the building down, you still have your childcare center totally on the edge.

So, anyway, we don't even need to get into today, but it just seems in sharing that information about building location, how do you reconcile the childcare center?

MR. BODNER: Yes. This is Adam. It was -- it was a late addition. Security was not

as big an issue back then. There were also temporary structures.

In looking at it now, it's still the -it's easier or makes more sense to put an addition
on it there, and improve the perimeter security,
unfortunately, closing the trail, otherwise we'd
have to tear the whole thing down and put it where?
In the middle, right, and so, there wasn't -- it's
a fairly constrained campus when you get right to
it. So, that was some of the logic with childcare.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Also, we've done a lot of studies, as it pertains to childcare and education, and having a childcare facility co-located in the learning environment is not conducive to learning.

Parents habits, they want to go check on their child and they get distracted --

PARTICIPANT: That's what I heard.

MR. GOLDSMITH: -- so, that separation does improve our educational process.

MS. WHITE: But I'm just thinking of where your stand-off -- they're not within the

stand-off protection area. So, it must be a real challenge.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Mr. May, were you to propose an amendment?

MR. MAY: Yes.

MS. WRIGHT: Could we address -- do you want to -- I need to talk parking ratios for a second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Go ahead, let's do that first.

MS. WRIGHT: Okay, keep writing. So, we have the -- we have agreed to defer this conversation with staff, because we've had some preliminary issues with the practicality and the necessity of getting to a one to four because this is kind of a run off facility with a different kind of use and we need to -- we have agreed that we need to talk further with the benefit of more information.

The parallels -- it's not -- it doesn't seem right to compare it to an office building.

We've sort of looked -- we've looked so far at

community colleges.

I hear today that -- of a corporate training facility. We're trying to collect a little bit more information and Diane and I have talked and agreed to talk further.

Certainly, we will get to some reconciliation, well, before the final.

So, we -- we're not sure that we can say that yes, we will be coming up with an action plan to get to one to four, at this time. I'm not saying we can't, but we just -- we're not -- it would be disingenuous to say -- to nod and say oh, yes, we're going to -- we'll do a plan to get there, at this point.

So, I'm just asking that we set it aside until -- for a much more -- a better informed conversation when we get to final.

MR. MAY: So, that's a request?

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Are you proposing an amendment or just --

MS. WRIGHT: No.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: -- putting it all out

there?

MS. WRIGHT: I'm just saying it.

MR. MAY: So, it's noted as a request.

MS. WRIGHT: Right. Well, I just want to mark it for right now.

MR. MAY: Good.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: And about when will this come back to us for final?

MS. SULLIVAN: Pretty --

MS. WRIGHT: June.

MS. SULLIVAN: Pretty soon, yes, the next couple of months.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Okay.

MS. WRIGHT: It's on fast track.

MR. MAY: So, I would make a motion that we modify the EDR to include the statement.

Recommends that the applicant examine alternatives to the proposed massing and possibly the location of Building B, with the intention of reducing potential impacts to the historic quad and to the natural areas of the campus.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Was that a request?

MR. MAY: That was a motion to amend --

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Motion? I mean --

MR. MAY: No, it was a recommends.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Recommends.

MR. GALLAS: I second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: The motion before us has been moved and seconded. All in favor of the motion say aye.

{Chorus of ayes.}

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Opposed, no? I'm going to be a 'no' on the motion.

So, the matter back before us is the EDR as amended. Any further discussion on the EDR as amended? Is there a motion on the amended EDR?

MS. WRIGHT: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and

MR. MAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor of the EDR as amended say aye.

{Chorus of ayes.}

CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Opposed, no? It's passed. Okay, well, thank you, Ms. Goldsmith, Mr. Bodner, thank you again for hosting us this morning and spending your afternoon with us here. We look forward to working with you more.

Just before we adjourn, I wanted to note
-- I failed to recognize Mr. Ahmed, who is sitting
in for Mr. Rhodes, welcome.

I also would note that Ms. Nuzzi from Senator Johnson's office has taken on additional staff duties, or other staff duties, and Josh McLeod is new representative from Senator Johnson's office. Welcome. You can see that we do a lot of important work. We get into a nerd-fest every now and then, as evidenced by today.

So, again, welcome, we look forward to your contributions, and we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:10 p.m.)